

Supreme Court U.S.
FILED

CASE NO.:

05-985 OCT 24 2005

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CHARLES J. TITTLE

Petitioner

vs.

DOROTHY D. BOTTORFF-TITTLE, SUPERIOR
COURT OF
ORANGE, COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF
CALIFORNIA

Respondents

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES
OF APPEAL FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

CHARLES J. TITTLE

5922 Par Circle

Huntington Beach, California 92649

714-840-3487

CASE NO.:

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CHARLES J. TITTLE

Petitioner

vs.

DOROTHY D. BOTTORFF-TITTLE, SUPERIOR
COURT OF
ORANGE, COUNTY OF ORANGE, STATE OF
CALIFORNIA

Respondents

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES
OF APPEAL FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

CHARLES J. TITTLE

5922 Par Circle

Huntington Beach, California 92649

714-840-3487

PETITIONER FOR CERTIORARI
QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Upon learning that federal plaintiff may have a lack of capacity, should the federal district court judge have suspended further proceedings under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 12(b)(6)?
2. Before dismissing plaintiff's 1983 Civil Rights Complaint, should the federal district judge have allowed plaintiff to amend his initial complaint?
3. Before denying plaintiff's appeal, should the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals also have considered appellee's attorney's admissions of his client's federal criminal conduct in California State court proceedings?
4. Should the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals have considered the California State Court's Denial

of Petitioner's Procedural Due Process Rights?

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 29.6, petitioner states that he has no parent companies or nonwholly owned subsidiaries

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page No.:</u>
Question Presented for Review	-i-
Corporate Disclosure Statement	-iii-
Table of Authorities Cited	-viii-
Citation of Opinions and Orders in Case	1
Jurisdictional Statement	2
Constitutional And Statutory Provisions Involved	
a. Federal Violation In State Courts	4
b. Violation of Federal	
Constitutional Rules In Federal Court	7

STATEMENT

A. Petitioner's History of Defendant's

Denial of Procedural Due Process In	
California State Courts	8
B. Petitioner's Federal Civil Rights	
Complaint	12
C. The Rooker-Feldman Doctrine Does	
Not Apply Because The State	
Appellate Judgment Did Not Consider	
Petitioner's Constitutional Claims	14
D. The Rooker-Feldman Doctrine Should	
Not Apply To Petitioner's 1983 Civil	
Rights Actions Where The State Courts	
Failed To Provide A State Ruling On	
Federal Constitutional Questions	17

WHY THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED	20
E. IN ALL THE COURT DECISION, HEARINGS AND DISCOVERY DID THE COURT ALLOW EXPERT WITNESSES FOR APPELLANT CHARLES TITTLE BE HEARD OR A TRIAL ON THE MERIT OF THE CASE TAKE PLACE. ESPECIALLY IN THE APPELLANT'S MENTAL STATE	22
CONCLUSION	24
List of Parties in Court Below	26

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Denial of petitioner's, Petition For Rehearing En

Banc

APPENDIX B

The Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals

APPENDIX C

The opinion of United States District

APPENDIX D

The Opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Fourth
District Court, Division Three

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

FEDERAL CASE	PAGE
Bianchi v. Rylaarsdam, 334 F.3d 895, 898 (9th Cir. 2003)	10&11
Brokaw v. Weaver, 305 F.3d 660, 664-665 (7th Cir. 2002)	8
Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz, 471 US at 472n14 (1985), 85 LE 2d 528, 105 S.Ct. 2174	17
Catz v. Chalker, 142 F.3d 279, 290-295 (6th Cir. 1998)	13
Collins v. Harker Hights-Texas, 503, U.S. 115, 119-127, 117 L.Ed 2d 261, 112 S.Ct 1061 (1992)	13

Conley v. Gibson, 335 U.S. 41, 45-46, 2 L.Ed 2d 80, 78 S.Ct. 99 (1957)	13, 21
Ferrelli v. River Manor Health Care Center, 323 F.3d 196, 201-202 (2nd Cir. 2003)	21
Hoblock v. Albany County Board of Elections 442 F.2d 77, 92-95 (2nd Cir. 2005).	24
Lujan v. G & G Fire Sprinkler, Inc., 532 US 189, 195 (2001)	19
Merrill Lynch Business Financial Service, Inc. v. Nudell, 363 F.3d 1072, 1075-1076 (10th Cir. 2004)	18
NAACO v. Hunt 891 F.2d 1555, 1560 (11 th Cir. 1990)	3

Nesses v. Shepard, 68 F.3d 1003, 1005 (7th Cir. 1995)	14
New Valley Corporate v. United States 119 F.3d 1576, 1580 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	3
<u>Robinson v. Anyaski</u> , 753 F.2d 1468, 1468, 1472-1473 (9th Cir. 1995) violated on other grounds, 477 U.S. 902, 91 Led 2d 560, 106 S.ct. 3265	18, 20
Rolf v. City of San Antonio, 77 F.3d 832, 828 (5th Cir. 1996)	22
Tittle v. Bottorff-Tittle et al	